DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 422 HE 003 665

AUTHOR	Fincher, Cameron
TITLE	The Need for Reform and Renewal in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Georgia Univ., Athens. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	6p.; Paper presented in the Cullom Lecture Series, Augusta College, September 11, 1972, and the Summer Scholar Seminar for Developing Colleges, the Georgia Center for Continuing Education, October 13, 1972
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Colleges; Educational Change; Educational Improvement; *Educational Planning; *Educational Research; *Higher Education; Reports; *Universities

ABSTRACT

Higher education has expanded to the point where the supply of educated manpower far outnumbers the demand. In answer to this problem, several task forces, committees and commissions have been appointed to examine the problems, issues and trends in higher education and to make recommendations that could serve the formulation of more meaningful public policies. The purpose of this paper is to review the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, the Assembly on University Goals and Governance of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the HEW Task Force on Higher Education, and the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Education. Running throughout the reports of the various commissions and task forces is a deep and pervasive concern with the future of higher education in this country. A combination of crises has convinced many educational leaders and spokesmen that higher education as it existed in the sixties is no longer adequate for the changing demands of the seventies and eighties. Implicit in almost all of the reports is the belief that unless reform and renewal are forthcoming, our colleges and universities cannot survive. (HS)

ED 070422

THE NEED FOR REFORM AND RENEWAL IN HIGHER EDUCATION*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Institute of Higher Education
University of Georgia

by
Cameron Fincher

In 1946 President Harry S. Truman appointed a prestigious commission to reexamine the American system of higher education in terms of its objectives, methods, and facilities. The specific questions to be considered by the Commission were ways of expanding educational opportunity, the adequacy of college curricula, the desirability of intermediate technical institutes, and the financial requirements for expanded physical facilities. The reason for appointing such a commission was due to the returning veterans of World War II and the ensuing problems that were taxing the resources and resourcefulness of colleges and universities.

The Commission responded to the President's charge with an optimistic endorsement of higher education and an expression of faith in the capability of the American people to provide an education for all who had the ability and the desire. Its major conclusion was that if American higher education was to fulfill its responsibilities in the second half of the twentieth century, there must be an accelerated adjustment in purpose, scope, content, and organization. The conviction was expressed that:

> American colleges and universities must envision a much larger role for higher education in the national life. They can no longer consider themselves merely the instrument for producing an intellectual elite; they must become the means by which every citizen, youth, and adult is enabled and encouraged to carry his education, formal and informal, as far as his native capacities permit. (p. 101)

The following twenty-five years witnessed a strenuous effort on the part of American colleges and universities to meet the challenge of the President's Commission. This effort may be attributed more to a rapidly growing population and an increasing demand for higher education than to the idealism expressed in the Commission's report, but it was real nonetheless. The effort to meet the increasing demand was spurred in the late fifties by a realization that the nation had suddenly been thrust into a race for outer space. There had been an apparent failure to produce the trained manpower that was needed in science, engineering, education, and health. This produced in turn an effort to extend, under federal sponsorship, facilities and programs for scientific, technical, and professional education. National goals and priorities were expressed in terms of specialized talent, its identification, and its development. National catastrophe was seen in the wastage of academically talented students and the misuse of specialized talent in minority groups and women.

In 1964 the first of the postwar babies turned eighteen, entered college and initiated a series of change that has not slackened. By the time they were seniors in 1968, they had produced a shock wave that threatened to destroy higher education as their parents had known it. By 1970 the space race had apparently been won, the teaching shortage had apparently turned to surplus, physical facilities were plentiful if they had not been bombed, a counterculture was apparently in full bloom, new manners and morals had apparently been adopted by both students and their teachers, there was talk about new life styles and alternative systems, a forceful pessimism had settled upon the entire estate of education, legislators were talking incessantly about accountability, and everyone connected with higher education in any way was left wondering what had happened.

Two decades of rapid expansion and optimistic faith had not prepared anyone for what did happen. Some cynics had indeed claimed that so much education could not truly educate, but they did not predict in any meaningful way the dire consequences of the late sixties and early seventies. Only one economist seems to have predicted the end of the teaching shortage in a way that could be verified. Allan Cartter had pointed out earlier that higher education was drawing many of its teachers from industry, business, government, and the military services and if this trend continued, the increased production of the graduate schools, coupled with the influx from other fields, would end the teacher shortage and produce a surplus of personnel who wanted to teach in colleges and universities.

The response of the American public in the past four years is characteristic. There have been cries of

HE 003 665

*This paper was initially presented in the Cullom Lecture Series at Augusta College on September 11, 1972 and later at the Summer Scholar Seminar for Developing Colleges at the Georgia Center for Continuing Education on October 13, 1972.

anguish, despair, betrayal, contempt, and denial. But more importantly, there has been a spreading belief that our colleges and universities have not been properly managed and that our youth have not been properly educated. The direct outcome was the appointment of numerous task forces, committees, and commissions to examine the problems, issues, and trends in higher education and to make recommendations that could serve the formulation of more meaningful public policies.

The purpose of this paper is to review briefly the major recommendations of the more important commissions and task forces concerned with higher education and to assess the extent to which those recommendations are shaping public policy for the remaining years of the twentieth century. The commissions and task forces which are considered here are the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, the Assembly on University Goals and Governance of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the HEW Task Force on Higher Education or Newman Commission, and the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Education. The extent to which commission recommendations have influenced public policy may be judged momentarily from their influence on the Educational Amendments Act passed by the U. S. Congress on June 23, 1972.

CARNEGIE COMMISSION

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education was established in 1967 and funded for a five year period at an annual rate of approximately one million dollars. Its mission was initially conceived as an effort to study the financial difficulties of colleges and universities but was quickly expanded to include the structure, function, and governance of higher education; the necessity of innovation and change; demand and expenditures; and the availability and use of resources. The purpose, therefore, is to make a systematic appraisal of higher education and to provide guidelines for its continued development.

The activities of the Commission have included research studies by experienced investigators in the social and behavioral science; a series of descriptive profiles of various segments of the higher education community; a series of reflective essays dealing with critical issues and trends; the review and analysis of selected policies, new developments, and alternative processes; and the preparation of special reports and recommendations. In the beginning it was expected that the Commission would issue a total of 75 to 80 publications, with a final comprehensive report at the conclusion of its work.

To date, the Commission has issued a total of nine ...ion reports, plus a supplementary report that ...ed revisions of its first report. Each of the reports contains specific suggestions and recommendations for the future direction and development of higher education. The audience for the reports is clearly the decision and policy makers of the nation, and the objective is reform and innovation in policy and governance.

Quality and Equality

The first report issued by the Commission proclaimed greater equality of educational opportunity to be the nation's first priority and recommended extensive federal support for both students and institutions at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The gist of the report was that the priorities of the sixties had been science, research, and graduate education. Those priorities must be replaced in the seventies by equality of opportunity, academic reform and innovation, and education for health services. To meet these priorities, the Commission recommended educational opportunity grants that would remove financial barriers for students with demonstrated need; supplementary grants that would encourage additional support from private, state, and local funds; scholarship funds that would permit better coverage of hardship cases; a national student loan bank that would be a private nonprofit corporation; and cost-of-education supplements to institutions that would be based on the number of other federal grants.

To encourage new academic programs and the improvement of educational procedures, the Commission recommended the establishment of a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education. A major function of the Foundation would be to work with the separate states in the planning and development of their postsecondary educational system.

A Chance To Learn

In its second report the Commission identified the first step in equal educational opportunity as the increased effectiveness of elementary and secondary schooling. The report asked that states provide universal access to its system of higher education by placing community colleges within commuting range; by preparing four-year colleges to accept qualified transfers; by accepting responsibility for service to disadvantaged minorities; and by providing compensatory education where it was necessary.

By the year 1976, the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, it was proposed that all economic barriers to educational opportunities be eliminated; that neither the curriculum nor the campus environment remain a source of inequity; and that questions of cultural balance no longer be a source of dissatisfaction. By the year 2000, the Commission hoped that the limitations of ethnic grouping, geographic location, age, and quality of previous schooling would be completely removed. Ability, motivation, and individual choice should be the only determinants of achievement.

Open-Door Colleges

In its third report the Commission became more explicit about access to higher education through

community colleges. The belief was stated that each state should provide the opportunity for each high school graduate to enter college somewhere within its total system of higher education. To achieve this accessibility the Commission recommended state legislation that would admit all applicants over 18 years of age who are capable of benefitting from education.

To provide meaningful options, the comprehensive community college should offer a variety of educational programs including transfer, continuing, remedial, occupational, and cultural education. The Commission did not believe it advisable to build additional two-year branches of universities or two-year technical institutes, or to permit extremes in enrollment except in sparsely populated areas and large cities. By 1976, there should be open access to all public community colleges; state plans should be developed for community colleges within commuting distance of most potential students; and tuition should either be low or nonexistent. By 1980, the nation should have an additional 175 to 235 community colleges and 35 to 40 percent of all undergraduate students should be enrolled in community colleges.

Less Time, More Options

The rigidity and limited flexibility of higher education were attacked in the fifth report issued by the Commission. To improve the structure, content, and functions of higher education, recommendations covered a shortened length of time to earn a degree; more options while doing so; better relationship to student interests; more appropriateness for subsequent employment; and the extension of opportunity to employed persons and older citizens.

The options advocated in the report included the option *not* to go to college; to delay entrance; to drop out and back in; and to change directions when desirable. Not only should the time for the baccalaureate be reduced by one-fourth, but the associate of arts degree should be generally available by 1980 and there should be new degrees like the master of philosophy and doctor of arts degrees. "Sandwich" programs should permit a better mixture of work and study while the exercise of credit by examination should permit a de-emphasis of certification altogether.

Capitol and Campus

In its seventh report the Commission reaffirmed the responsibility of state government for higher education. To meet this responsibility, the states must move now to educate a greater proportion of its population; to educate citizens over a longer period of their lifetimes; to provide higher levels, broader ranges, and alternative routes of training; and to supply the manpower and expertise that are needed for the state's social priblems and changing occupational patterns.

Statewide planning and coordination were regarded as essential, but the push for public accountability should not destroy institutional independence. To maintain a dual system of public and private higher education, the Commission recommended state support for private institutions through construction loans and grants for selected educational programs. Where these forms of state support were not adequate, the Commission advocated the issuance of cost-of-education vouchers that could be used by students at private institutions.

New Students and New Places

A ninth report in 1971 considered the problems of institutional size and recommended that limitations be placed on institutional growth. Universities should not exceed enrollments of 20,000; comprehensive colleges should remain under 10,000; liberal arts colleges should not go above 2,500; and two-year colleges above 5,000. The report also set minimum enrollment objectives.

The Commission also recognized the need for new comprehensive colleges, especially in urban areas, and recommended that 60 to 70 such colleges be added by 1980. Seven specific metropolitan areas were identified as being in special need because of the low ratio of college enrollment to population. The Commission reiterated their recommendations for more flexible patterns of participation in higher education and specifically advocated the development of external degree programs and open universities.

Other reports issued by the Commission prior to 1972 deal with the particular issues and problems of medical and dental education, colleges for black Americans, and student dissent and disruption. The recurring theme throughout the reports, however, is the demand for major reform in the structure and functions of American higher education. The points that continue to be made in virtually all the Commission publications is that higher education must become more accessible; more flexible; more responsive; and better managed.

ASSEMBLY ON UNIVERSITY GOALS AND GOVERNANCE

The report of the Assembly on University Goals and Governance is of special importance because it reflects to some extent the viewpoint of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, an organization that could easily have been expected to maintain an elitist viewpoint of higher education. It is also the most eloquent statement on higher education that has appeared to the present time.

The Assembly was established in 1969 to "explore, develop, and help implement alternative approaches for resolving certain of the principal issues affecting colleges and universities today." The work was divided among policy councils that considered independently the topical areas assigned them. Their results are expressed in the form of 85 theses that are presented in numerical order only. The theses are constructed, however, around nine themes dealing with the numerous problems and issues the Assembly

considered. These theses may be identified as follows:

1. Learning is reaffirmed as the central mission of the university. Research, service, and other functions are appropriate only when they contribute to learning and when they are consonant with the academic freedoms on which learning depends.
2. Knowledge must provide the basis for improvement and reform. To solve their present problems, colleges must know more about their educational programs and their decision processes. This should result in a kind of knowledge that does not now exist.
3. Colleges ought to be open to those who are able and ready to benefit. Those who attend should do so by choice. Institutions should define their mission in ways that permit a suitable choice by persons of all ages.
4. Experimentation and flexibility is needed in both undergraduate and graduate education. New options should be devised for a liberal education that would infuse work and apprenticeship with intellectual content.
5. The diversification of higher education should be maintained and differentiated value systems should be preserved. The diversity of student aptitudes and aspirations calls for different paths to self-fulfillment.
6. Educational diversity and differentiation is dependent upon the preservation of private institutions. Financial assistance to students would permit them to choose an institution according to their needs and competencies and thereby enable public and private institutions to complement one another.
7. The art of teaching must be upgraded and the professoriate enhanced. Collective and self-enforcing codes of responsibility are needed, and both entrance and exit to the profession should be made simpler.
8. Leadership must be strengthened and the authority and responsibility of the president restored. There must, however, be an organizational structure that encourages communication and gives opportunity for initiative and review. Leadership should give weight to the opinions and values of the entire university community.
9. The financial difficulties of many institutions are acknowledged but colleges and universities should "husband the resources they already have." There should be "new procedures and new institutional forms that will make cooperation and self-help more of a reality."

The sweep of the AAAS theses covers most of the problems and issues dealt with in the Carnegie Commission reports. The theses are not presented as formal recommendations, but they provide an impressive "agenda for reforming higher education." Women, blacks, Indians, and Spanish-speaking citizens weigh heavily in most of the theses dealing with access to higher education. Implicit in the theses is the belief that the removal of barriers is not enough. Institutions should adopt positive strategies of recruitment and accommodation, and programs of instruction should be geared to the level of preparation that disadvantaged groups bring to the college.

The Assembly's goals are broad, general, and exhortative. There is some confusion about the objectives and purposes of the report, however, and it is not at all certain as to whom the theses are addressed. But they do reflect a great deal of prestigious thinking and they are genuinely provocative.

HEW TASK FORCE

The "Report on Higher Education" issued by the HEW Task Force is one of the more interesting documents to appear on the subject of higher education. In almost every sense of the word, the report in intent, style, and content is iconoclastic. Significantly, the task force was appointed by the Secretary of HEW, and the report was submitted to him, rather than the Commissioner of Education. The fact that the report was endorsed by the Secretary may account for some of the widespread interest shown in the report.

The major thrust of the report is that our colleges are not serving the needs of an expanding population of students, and it raises no little issue as to whether higher education needs to be academic education. The stand taken in the report is quite strong. Members of the task force have little faith in higher education as it is presently constituted and they make no effort to conceal the fact. They believe their report to be more attentive to the needs of students than the nation's institutions are. It is the changing needs of these students that demand "new enterprises" in higher education and "new ways of going to college." They are most dubious of the current efforts to bring about reform and believe drastic action on the part of the federal goverment to be necessary. To this end, they recommend the establishment of a National Foundation for Higher Education. The Purpose of the Foundation is to develop "new sequences and modes of education" and "new uses of faculties and facilities."

Among their recommendations are changes in admission policies that would permit students to drop in and out of college; internships and apprenticeships that would integrate coursework with job experience; a great diversification of college faculties with dismissal of the usual academic criteria in their selection; and the elimination of traditional courses except as a response to expressed needs of the students. The most significant of their recommendations is the funding of regional examining universities that would break "the degree-granting monopoly" of colleges and universities. The examining universities would be established for the sole purpose of examining students and issuing credentials. No coursework would be offered but degrees would be conferred on the basis of examinations.

Under preparation by the task force is a second report in which they are considering the issues and problems of graduate education; the role of video technology in the field of higher education; a "G.I. Bill" for community services rendered by students; and the implementation of the regional examining universities. The latter would be tied more closely to the pervasive interest in some kind of performance standards for learning, external degree programs, and the open university concept.

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RESOURCES AND ADVANCED EDUCATION

Little noticed and unappreciated by the Carnegie Commission, the Assembly on Goals and Governance, and the HEW Task Force was the work of an earlier commission concerned with the supply and demand of educated manpower. The purpose of this commission was to project the supply of college graduates in the future, estimate the demand for their services, and analyze the adjustments that were likely to be necessary in matching the two.

The Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Education was appointed by the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Council on Education, and the National Academy of Sciences–National Research Council and Social Science Research Council. The project was founded by the Carnegie Corporation and the Russell Sage Foundation. The staff work was done during the mid-sixties, and the report published in 1970.

Among the findings of the Commission was an expected increase in the number of persons earning baccalaureate degrees. College enrollment was expected to increase through the seventies but a decline was possible after 1982. The occupational demand for engineering, law, medicine, nursing, and social work degrees was expected to exceed the supply, but teaching had reached something of a transition point. There was a possibility that elementary school enrollment may decline and high school enrollment to remain steady. The major implication, however, was that greater selectivity would be possible in both public school teachers and in college faculty members.

Perhaps the most important issue delineated by the study was the conclusion that the national system of higher education was producing more college graduates than were needed for replacement and growth purposes. Since 1950 graduates had been available in the labor market to upgrade the educational level of occupations that had not previously attracted or demanded college graduates. This trend has been slowed somewhat during the sixties because of accelerated growth but had picked up again and was expected to continue. The major policy issues were seen as the elimination of socio-economic differentials in access to higher education and in educational achievement, the need for education that would equip graduates for occupational mobility, the changing distribution of ability in the college population, and the role of the federal government in the adjustment mechanisms of the manpower marketplace. Other problems and issues concerned the need to plan career shifts that would be necessitated by the changing pattern of supply and demand; the need for criteria of effective professional performance; and the development of talent among special groups.

In brief, the system had worked reasonably well in developing and utilizing the nation's human resources. There were imperfections in the system, however, and these would require careful attention if the system is to remain open.

EDUCATIONAL AMENDMENTS ACT

Public policy concerning higher education is influenced by numerous and diverse sources in national thought and discussion. The development of policy is frequently a gradual process that takes small and painful steps. Only in the event of a national emergency does the policy-making process accelerate to the extent that advocates of change would prefer. There are many who feel that such a national emergency does exist in the field of higher education and that decisive action is long overdue. Indeed, it is an impatience with the typical pace of change that has prompted much of the activity of the various committees, commissions, and task forces.

The Educational Amendments Act of 1972 is the best indication to date of change in national policy for higher education. The revisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other acts related to higher education was neither hasty nor swift. Like most legislation, the Act involved intensive discussion in both the House and the Senate. When the two separate bills were finally passed, they required a great deal of reconciliation, with the Senate version more or less dominant. The primary purpose of the Act was to extend authorizations that were included in previous acts, but numerous modifications and appendages reveal the influence of the commissions and task forces that sought to change public policy on educational matters.

The influence of the Carnegie Commission is readily apparent. The Educational Amendments Act not only includes many Commission recommendations but frequently incorporates the same terminology. Contained in the Act are basic educational opportunity grants, supplemental grants, state incentive grants, and the creation of a Student Loan Marketing Association. The basic grants provide $1400 per student less any amount his family can be expected to contribute toward his education and may be used to pay up to 50 percent of the actual cost of attendance. Supplemental grants up to $1500 may be made to students who would be unable to attend college without the grant. Incentive grants to the states are provided in an effort to encourage non-federal financial assistance to students.

Cost-of-education payments may be made to the institutions enrolling recipients of basic and supple-

mental grants. Scaled to the institution's enrollment and its number of grant recipients, the payment may provide up to $500 per recipient.

Also prominent in the Act are many of the Commission's recommendations concerning community colleges and the role of statewide planning. The Act provides strong encouragement for the development of a statewide plan that would facilitate access and establish priorities for the use of resources. The state plan must be developed by a state commission that is representative of the public and private sectors in the state. Grants may be made for the establishment of new community colleges or to existing ones that need to expand their enrollment, establish new campuses, modify programs, or lease needed facilities.

The National Foundation for Higher Education, as proposed by both the Carnegie Commission and the HEW Task Force, was not authorized as such, but its purposes and functions have been authorized, along with authorized funding of $10 million for the first year. The Act gives the Secretary of HEW grants and contract authority for the purpose of encouraging reform, innovation, and improvement; creating new institutions and programs; producing change in internal structures and operations; creating new institutions and programs for examining and credentialing; and introducing reform in virtually all areas of higher education.

It is clear from a reading of the Educational Amendments Act that the voice of the various commissions and task forces have been heard in the corridors of Congress. Public policy in higher education is being shaped and influenced by educational leaders who may or may not represent the full range and sweep of higher education. As much as anyone may disagree with the directions being taken and the distance that has been covered, there can be no doubt that public policy is being changed.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Running throughout the reports of the various commissions and task forces is a deep and pervasive concern with the future of higher education in this country. A combination of crises has convinced many educational leaders and spokesmen that higher education as it existed in the sixties is no longer adequate for the changing demands of the seventies and eighties. Implicit in almost all the reports is the belief that unless reform and renewal are forthcoming, our colleges and universities cannot survive.

It would be easy to dismiss many of the recommendations as idealistic, utopian or simply rhetorical. This was undoubtedly the response to much in the President's Commission report of 1947. Most educators recognized a need for the rapid expansion of educational opportunity, the lessening of elitist conceptions, and the broadening of curricula offerings. Yet, the majority did not interpret the Commission report as a mandate for universal education at the college level. The Commission did indeed state that "democracy will not survive unless American schools and colleges are given the means for improvement and expansion." And as mentioned previously, they specifically said that our colleges must enable and encourage the student to go "as far as his native capacities permit."

But if the phraseology of that Commission is dated and outmoded, it would not be wise to wait until the same is true of the Carnegie Commission, the Assembly on Goals and Governance, and the Newman Commission. Each commission has something important to say about higher education and its future. As much as anyone may chafe at the thinly veiled threats of "alternative systems," "other options," "examining universities," and "breaking the credentials monopoly," the implications are nonetheless clear. There is a need for reform and renewal in higher education.

REFERENCES

1. President's Commission on Higher Education, *Higher Education for American Democracy: Establishing the Goals*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947.
2. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education,
   Quality and Equality
   A Chance to Learn
   The Open-Door Colleges
   Higher Education and the Nation's Health
   Less Time, More Options
   From Isolation to Mainstream
   The Capitol and the Campus
   Dissent and Disruption
   New Students and New Places
   New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Princeton Road, Hightstown, New Jersey 08520.
3. Assembly on University Goals and Governance, *A First Report*. Cambridge, Mass.: Author, 7 Linden Street, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.
4. HEW Task Force on Higher Education, *Report on Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.
5. John K. Folger, Helen S. Astin, and Alan E. Bayer, *Human Resources and Higher Education*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 230 Park Avenue, New York 10017.

November, 1972
Athens, Georgia 30601